

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-20 are pending in this application. The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 20 USC §112 because of an improper use of antecedent basis. The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by England, U.S. Patent No. 6,775,779.

In response, the applicant has amended claims 1, 12 and 17 and cancelled claim 3. Claims 1, 2 and 4-20 are pending in this application. The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are considered by applicant to overcome each of the Examiner's outstanding rejections. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore requested.

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner contends that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the claim language "said firewalls." Claim 1 has been amended by changing the word "firewalls" to "firewall" thereby removing the lack of antecedent basis. As such, this rejection has been traversed.

In the office action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by England, U.S. Patent No. 6,775,779. Claims 1, 12 and 17 have been amended. In rejecting claim 3, the Examiner asserted that England described the use of secret keys and that description met the limitation of using a private decryption key unique to the platform. However, the Examiner misinterprets England with respect to the use of secret keys. Simply because a key is secret does not mean that it is unique to that particular platform. In addition, England describes the use of secret keys as an additional authorization step with the ultimate goal being the broadening of the list of trusted components to get access. England does not teach the use of keys that are unique to that individual platform to achieve the same result as amended claim 1. By making the key unique to the specific platform, the system can ensure that data content will be authorized for use on that particular platform alone to the exclusion of other platforms. Unauthorized copying and/or transfer of that data to an unauthorized platform will be

prevented. As such, England does not anticipate amended claim 1. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite the additional claim language that “wherein said operating system decrypts said input data with a private decryption key unique to that specific computer platform to ensure that said input data is authorized for access on said specific computer platform alone.” (emphasis added).

Independent claims 12 and 17 have been amended to recite similar language. In particular, both claim 12 and 17 have been amended to recite that the operating system is authenticated “to ensure that said operating system is approved to be loaded on that specific computer platform alone.” As such, England does not describe these claims as well.

Claims 2, 4-11, 13-16 and 18-20 are all dependent on claims 1, 12 or 17 and should be allowable for the same reasons that claims 1, 12 and 17 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration and prompt notice to that affect are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

July 18, 2005
SC:dw
(212) 521-5400

By: 
Stephen M. Chin, Reg. No. 39,938
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022-7650